REMARKS

The Applicants request reconsideration of the final rejection dated May 8, 2006.

Claims 1-8 remain pending.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to relocate the limitation that the disturbance data XI and the processed disturbance data XO each have a constant hamming weight, so that the introduction of each of these disturbance data is directly linked to the constant hamming weight limitation. The purpose of the relocation is so that it is more clear that the input data D1 and the processed transformed data H2 are each disturbed by constant-hamming-weight disturbance data. As previously argued, the prior art disturbance data was not required to have a constant hamming weight.

The Applicants repeat the arguments previously submitted in the Reply filed October 16, 2006. Specifically, the Applicants earnestly submit that the person of ordinary skill would not achieve the invention claimed in claim 1 by simply applying the express teachings of Jaffe to the admitted prior art.

In addition to the previously-advanced arguments, the Applicants request the Examiner to consider the result of the person of ordinary skill attempting to modify the admitted prior art according to Jaffe. As previously mentioned, and using the terminology of the present specification, Jaffe maps input data D1 to obtain data H1. On the other hand, the admitted prior art disturbs input data D1 with disturbance data Y1 to obtain data H1. Respectfully, if one were to apply the mapping of Jaffe to the teachings of the admitted prior art, one would have to perform a mapping of something. One would seem to map the input data D1, for example, before

disturbing D1 with disturbance data Y1, or perhaps one would disturb D1 with the disturbance data Y1 and then map the resulting data to obtain H1 with a constant hamming weight.

However, the former example (i.e., mapping D1 prior to disturbing it) would already achieve the result sought by Jaffe, namely, H1 with a constant hamming weight. Thus, there would be required a teaching of the subsequent disturbance with disturbance data YI having a constant hamming weight, to achieve the claimed invention. However, Jaffe does not teach to map <u>twice</u>, and thus this example seems to be insufficient to render obvious the claimed invention.

Applying Jaffe according to the second example is likewise different from the claimed invention. According to the claimed invention, the disturbance data <u>itself</u> has a constant hamming weight. If the person of ordinary skill were to map the disturbed data according to the suggestion of Jaffe (parenthetically, the Applicants do not admit that such a mapping is suggested), the disturbance data itself would not have a constant hamming weight as required by the claims. Thus, even in this example, the claimed invention is not met by any combination of the admitted prior art and Jaffe.

The Applicants again request the Examiner to address each of the arguments set forth in the Remarks filed October 16, 2006. The Applicants thank the Examiner for the discussion in the Advisory Action of claim 6, which will be addressed in a paper subsequent to this one.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Mattingly, Stanger & Malur, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (referencing attorney docket no. NIT-295).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

Daniel J. Stanger
Registration No. 32,846

DJS/sdb
(703) 684-1120

10